

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the instant response. Claims 1, 9 and 19 have been amended herein. Claims 1-23 remain pending in the case. No new matter has been added as a result of these amendments.

CLAIM REJECTIONS 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 3-9, 11-16, 18 and 23 are rejected under U.S.C 102(e) as being anticipated by US patent no. 6,198,696 issued to Korpi et al. (hereafter referred to as Korpi). Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 3-9, 11-16, 18 and 23 are not anticipated or suggested by Korpi for the following rational.

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to amended Claim 1, which recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to (emphasis added):

A method of management of time zone information in a calendar application comprising:
storing an event, said event comprising a start time and an end time based on a first time zone;
establishing a display time zone wherein said display time zone is user customizable and independent of events associated with said calendar application;

translating the start time and the end time from said first time zone to the display time zone to produce a translated start time and end time; and
displaying the event as occurring at the translated start time and end time.

Claim 1 has been amended such that the display time is independent of events associated with the calendar application. Independent Claim 9 and independent Claim 19 recite similar limitations. Claims 3-8 that depend from independent Claim 1, Claims 10-16 and 18 that depend on independent Claim 9, and Claim 23 that depends on independent Claim 19 provide further recitations of the features of the present invention.

Korpi and the claimed invention are very different. Applicants understand Korpi to teach a method for tracking time zone changes in communications devices wherein the time-of-day-clock is dynamically adjusted in accordance with a travel schedule (column 2, lines 26-29). Korpi purports to teach that the reference time (time-of-day-clock) is based upon anticipated travel of the device (Column 5 lines 18-20), which teaches away from the present invention.

Korpi admits the dynamic adjustment of the time-of-day clock will lead to a display of inaccurate time information if a user postpones a trip without updating the information in the itinerary of the memory (Column 5 lines 26-30). Dynamic adjustment of the reference clock teaches away from the claimed limitations of

the present invention because the reference time of the present invention is independent of events associated with the calendar application, as claimed.

Korpi associates the reference time with an anticipated trip event, e.g., events associated with the calendar application (Column 5 lines 38-39), however, the claimed embodiments of the present invention do not associate the reference time with an anticipated event. Specifically, independent Claims 1 and 9 recite the limitation "wherein said display time zone is user customizable and independent of events associated with said calendar application." Making the reference time dependent on planned events, as taught by Korpi, actually teaches away from the claimed limitations of the present invention because with Korpi, the dynamic adjustment of the time-of-day clock will lead to a display of inaccurate time information if a user postpones a trip without updating the events associated with the calendar application.

With Korpi, if a user inadvertently forgets to modify the travel schedule, the displayed time for planned events will be inaccurate. Specifically, Korpi's reference time is dependent on events associated with the calendar application, which is the opposite of the claimed embodiments of the invention wherein the reference time is independent of the events associated with the calendar application. The claimed limitations of the present invention use a display time zone that is independent of the planned events, as claimed. Thus, the claimed

embodiments of the present invention will not display inaccurate time information if a user postpones a trip because the display time is independent of anticipated events in the calendar.

Applicants respectfully assert that nowhere does Korpi teach, disclose or suggest the present invention as recited in independent Claims 1 and 9, and that these Claims are thus in a condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Korpi does not teach or suggest the additional claimed limitations of the present invention as recited in Claims 3-8, which depend from independent Claim 1, Claims 10-16 and 18, which depend from independent Claim 9 and Claim 23. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 3-9, 11-16, 18 and 23 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), and are in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 2 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Korpi in view of Pub No US 2003/0009411 issued to Ram et al (hereafter referred to as Ram). Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 2 and 10 is patentable over Korpi in view of Ram for the following rational.

As stated above, Korpi and the claimed invention are very different. Korpi actually teaches away from the claimed invention by associating the reference time with an anticipated travel event, e.g., the reference time is dependent on events associated with the calendar application which is opposite of the reference time being independent of events associated with the calendar application, as claimed. Ram does not remedy the deficiencies in Korpi. In fact, Ram teaches transforming NASDAQ Level II data for any selected security, at any instant in time, into a format suitable for display on the grid-based graphical display (paragraph 0269). Applicants understand “grid-based” to refer to a grid-based computing environment (Abstract) and not to a daily time grid, as claimed.

Applicants respectfully assert that nowhere does the combination of Korpi and Ram teach, disclose or suggest the present invention as recited in Claims 2, or 10 and that these claims are thus in a condition for allowance.

Claims 17 and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Korpi in view of US Pat No 6, 631, 402 issued to Devine et al (hereafter referred to as Devine). Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the claimed embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 17 and 19-22 are patentable over Korpi in view of Devine.

As stated above, Korpi and the claimed invention are very different. Korpi actually teaches away from the claimed invention by associating the reference time with an anticipated travel event. Devine does not remedy the deficiencies in Korpi. Devine may purport to teach selection of a time zone by menu choice for establishing a report schedule (column 18 lines 21-25), but Devine fails to teach or suggest a reference time that is independent of events associated with a calendar application, as claimed by the present invention. Furthermore, Devine fails to teach or suggest translating a start time and an end time from a first time zone to a display time zone to produce a translated start time and end time, as claimed.

Applicants respectfully assert that nowhere does the combination of Korpi and Devine teach, disclose or suggest the claimed embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 17 and 19-22 and that these claims are thus in a condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed remarks, reconsideration of the amended Claims is requested. Based on the arguments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-23 overcome the rejections and objections of record and, therefore, allowance of Claims 1-23 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner have a question regarding the instant response, the Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO L.L.P.

Dated: 02/16, 2004



Anthony Murabito
Registration No. 35,295

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060